

1
2
3
4
5
6
7


8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 Northern District of California
10 Oakland Division

11 A F ROTHSCHILD FUND, No. C 11-02760 LB
12 v. Plaintiff, **ORDER DENYING EXTENSION**
13 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND [ECF No. 18]
14 HUMAN SERVICES, *et al.*,
15 Defendant.

16 /
17 On August 12, 2011, the parties filed a stipulation to extend Plaintiff's time to respond to
18 Defendants' motion to dismiss from August 19, 2011 to September 26, 2011. ECF No. 18 at 2. As
19 the parties acknowledge, this schedule does not comport with the current Civil Local Rules, which
20 fix the deadlines for filing opposition and reply briefs. (It also does not comport with the old rules
21 regarding the 35-day filing deadlines for motions.) The court does not find good cause for a 28-day
22 extension and, accordingly, **DENIES** the parties' requested extension. N.D. Cal. L.R. 6-2(b) ("After
23 receiving a stipulated request under this Rule, the Judge may grant, deny or modify the requested
24 time change."). However, the court **EXTENDS** Plaintiff's time to file an opposition to September 6,
25 2011. Defendants' optional reply is due September 13, 2011.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27 Dated: August 19, 2011


28 LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge